

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY**

**Crl.P.M.P.Nos.780 & 781 of 2017**  
**AND**  
**CRIMINAL PETITION No.826 of 2017**

**COMMON ORDER:**

1 This Criminal Petition is filed under Section 482 of Cr.PC to quash the proceedings against the petitioner in Cr.No.252 of 2016 on the file of Station House Officer, Mahaboobnagar Rural Police Station, registered for the offences punishable under Section 374 of IPC and Section 3 (1) (h) of S.Cs & S.Ts (PoA) Amendment Act, 2015 and Sections 3, 7, 8 and 14 of Child Labour Prohibition & Regulation Act 1986 and Section 26 of Juvenile Justice Act, 2000.

2 Crl.P.M.P.No.780 of 2017 is filed to permit the petitioner to compound the offences and Crl.P.M.P.No.781 of 2017 is filed to permit the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to compromise the matter with the petitioner.

3 Petitioner and the respondent Nos.2 and 3 are present. Sri Ch.Srinivasa Reddy learned counsel identified the petitioner. Smt. Jaya Vindhya Advocate representing Smt. Vanga Anitha learned counsel identified the respondent Nos.2 and 3.

4 Respondent Nos.2 and 3 submitted in the open court that they voluntarily entered into compromise with the petitioner at the advice of elders. They further submitted that nobody compelled or forced them to enter into compromise with the petitioner. The offences punishable under Section 374 of IPC and Section 3 (1) (h) of S.Cs & S.Ts (PoA) Amendment Act, 2015 and Sections 3, 7, 8 and 14 of Child Labour Prohibition & Regulation Act 1986 and Section 26 of Juvenile Justice Act, 2000 are non-compoundable.

5 In **Shiji alias Pappu v Radhika**<sup>1</sup>, the Supreme Court held as under:

“It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 CrPC is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse exercise of its power under Section 482 CrPC. That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between compounding of offences by the parties before the trial court or in appeal on the one hand and the exercise of power by the High Court to quash the prosecution under Section 482 CrPC on the other. While a court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 CrPC are not for that purpose controlled by Section 320 CrPC.”

6 In **Gian Singh v State of Punjab**<sup>2</sup>, the apex Court observed as under:

“..... In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

7 Taking into consideration the factum of settlement arrived at between the parties, this court is of the view that even if the proceedings are allowed to continue, the second respondent may not support the case of the prosecution. No purpose will be served in keeping the matter pending in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

---

<sup>1</sup> (2011) 10 SCC 705

<sup>2</sup> (2012) 10 SCC 303

8 Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and also the principle enunciated in the cases cited supra, I am of the considered view that it is a fit case to quash the proceedings.

9 In the result, CrI.P.M.P.No.780 of 2017 and CrI.P.M.P.No.781 of 2017 are allowed, quashing the proceedings against the petitioner in Cr.No.252 of 2016 on the file of Station House Officer, Mahaboobnagar Rural Police Station. Miscellaneous petitions, if any pending in the criminal petition, shall stand closed.

---

**T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J.**

Date: 18<sup>th</sup> July, 2017.

**Kvsn**

